




BC

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

identifying data deleted  
prevent early unwar  
invas personal


OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS  
425 Eye Street N.W.  
U.I.B., 3rd Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20536



JAN 29 2003

File: [REDACTED] Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date:  
LIN 02 030 51460

IN RE: Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:



Petition: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional Pursuant to § 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(3)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



PUBLIC COPY

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office that originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,  
EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a structural engineering firm. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a structural drafter. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by an individual labor certification, the Application for Alien Employment Certification (Form ETA 750), approved by the Department of Labor.

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(3)(A)(i), provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who are capable, at the time of petitioning for classification under this paragraph, of performing skilled labor (requiring at least two years training or experience), not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

8 C.F.R. 204.5(g)(2) states in pertinent part:

*Ability of prospective employer to pay wage.* Any petition filed by or for an employment-based immigrant which requires an offer of employment must be accompanied by evidence that the prospective United States employer has the ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner must demonstrate this ability at the time the priority date is established and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. Evidence of this ability shall be either in the form of copies of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements.

Eligibility in this matter hinges on the petitioner's ability to pay the wage offered as of the petition's priority date, which is the date the request for labor certification was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the Department of Labor. Matter of Wing's Tea House, 16 I & N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977). Here, the petition's priority date is November 9, 1999. The beneficiary's salary as stated on the labor certification is \$17.95 per hour or \$37,336 per year.

Counsel initially submitted insufficient evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date and continuing to the present. In a request for evidence (herein RFE) of January 4, 2002, the director required additional evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage as

of the stated priority date and continuing to present.

Counsel submitted copies of the petitioner's 1999 and 2000 Form 1120S U.S. Income Tax Return for an S Corporation, the unaudited, personal financial statement dated September 18, 2001 of a corporate shareholder, and a letter from the petitioner's accountant.

The federal tax return for 1999 reflected gross receipts of \$65,460, gross profit of \$65,460, compensation of officers of \$34,800, salaries and wages of \$16,186, and an ordinary (loss) of (\$8,188). The accountant's letter stated, "... it is the customary practice for an owner/shareholder to invest personal capital into their business during slow or down periods."

The director determined that the evidence did not establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage and denied the petition.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief and states,

... As an S corporation, specifically for tax purposes, the federal government has been treating the Petitioner and its shareholders as one entity. This treatment should extend to applications submitted for immigration benefits. The corporation and the owner, as a shareholder, must be treated as a single entity. Therefore, both the company's assets and the owner's assets must be taken into account...

Counsel does not state the authority for this proposition. Contrary to counsel's primary assertion, the Service may not "pierce the corporate veil" and look to the assets of the corporation's owner to satisfy the corporation's ability to pay the proffered wage. It is an elementary rule that a corporation is a separate and distinct legal entity from its owners and shareholders. See Matter of M, 8 I & N Dec. 24 (BIA 1958), Matter of Aphrodite Investments, Ltd., 17 I & N Dec. 530 (Comm. 1980), and Matter of Tessel, 17 I & N Dec. 631 (Act. Assoc. Comm. 1980). Consequently, assets of its shareholders or of other enterprises or corporations cannot be considered in determining the petitioning corporation's ability to pay the proffered wage.

A careful consideration of the tax returns discloses that the petitioner has not established its ability to pay the proffered wage at the priority date and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. The petitioner has not overcome the director's decision.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.